



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

REPORTS.

ARCHIV FÜR LATEINISCHE LEXICOGRAPHIE UND GRAMMATIK. Zweiter Jahrgang. Heft 2.

On pp. 157-202 Thielmann continues his discussion of "Habere mit dem Infinitiv und die Entstehung des romanischen Futurums." He shows what causes operated to bring about the extinction of the future-active forms like *credam, amabit*, which carried with it the loss of the passive forms like *credar, amabitur*. The forms in *-am* perished first, by reason of their identity with the pres. subj. This identity led to the use of *respondeam* for *respondebo, perspicat* for *perspiciet*, etc. Moreover, the forms *credēs, credet*, were confused in the vulgar pronunciation with *credis, credit*, and the tendency in Romance to accent the vowel of the ending, cf. Ital. *vendéte*, contributed strongly to the disintegration. It was natural that the present, as the tense in more frequent use, should maintain itself. To obviate confusion, the vulgar language coined forms like *credebo*, and Sergius Explan., in Donat., G. L. IV, p. 552, 13 ff., warns against the use of *legebo* and *cognoscebis*. In archaic Latin the same tendency is already apparent in forms like *audibo, dormibo*. Even these forms were threatened with destruction by the spread of Betacismus, whereby *amavit* was pronounced like *amabit* and vice versa. Hence, in Salvianus, gub. d. 5, 6r, we find *liberandus a deo non eris* (= *liberaberis*), *nisi te ipse damnaveris*. In Africa, especially where betacism flourished, the need of new substitutes for the future made itself early felt. Future-perfect forms like *amaveris* could not be used, because here too there was confusion with the perf. subj., and in the contracted form with the imperf. subj. *amares*. Hence it was necessary to resort to some periphrastic form like *amans ero* (of which, however, Thielmann is able to give no example, although forms like *amandus ero* occur for the passive), or the use of *facere, reddere, dare*, with a perfect participle—e. g., *effectum dabo=efficiam*. Much more important, however, are the locutions made up of an auxiliary verb with an infinitive. The following possibilities of expression presented themselves: 1. *esse*. In English we have *I am to go*, in Ital. *essendo per amare=amaturus*. In Fredegar, 4, 40, Thielmann finds a single doubtful example, *pollicetur esset implere* for *esse impleturum*. 2. *habere*. Analogues to the use of *habere* in other languages are given. 3. *posse*. This use is well known after *sperare*; it is extended in the *Scriptores Historiae Augustae*, but seems not to have taken a deep hold of the language. 4. *debere*, as in Sardinian. 5. *velle*, as in Wallachian. A vulgar tendency is noted, as in Sulpicius, Cic. ad. fam. 4, 5, 4, to say *volo tibi commemorare* for *commemorabo*. Other examples not in 1 pers. sing. are given from the later Latin. 6. *incipere*. 7. *ire, venire*, with supine or infin.; cf. *ultum ire*, Sall. Jug. 68, 1, and the inf. fut. pass. with *iri*. In Romance dialects *venire* and *vado* are thus used; cf. Fr. *je vais dire*. Of these numerous possibilities of expressing the future, the construction with *habere* seems to have proved the strongest. Porphyryon on Horace, Epist. 2, 1, 17, has *nasci habere=natum iri*.

Thielmann gives in detail the progress of the idiom in Cyprian, Novatianus, Arnobius and Lactantius in the translations of ecclesiastical works and of the Bible, as well as in the *Acta Martyrum*. The use by Servius (*Aen.* 3, 457; 5, 712) of *velle habet* for *volet*, may prove a valuable indication of his African descent, for this usage of *habere* down to the second half of the fourth century is mainly found in African Latinity. The latter part of Thielmann's exhaustive article is devoted to showing how, chiefly through the influence of theological writers, the idiom spread to other parts of the Roman empire. Down to Augustine only verbs of the third and fourth conjugation form their future with *habeo*, but he uses *habet orare* for *orabit*, *respondere habet* for *respondebit*. The first forerunner of the Romance conditional is found in a work whose author is unknown, but who was probably an African of the fifth century. Migne, Vol. 39, col. 2214, 6, *sanare te habebat deus, si confitereris*. This leads to an excursus on the forms of unreal condition like *facturus eram*, and *facturus fui* for *fecissem*, and *facturus fueram* and *fuissem*, in which many valuable facts respecting the classical usage are brought out. The fact that the Italians Cassiodorus and Venantius prefer *habui* to *habebam* with the infinitive in these conditional clauses is significant, inasmuch as the Italian forms its conditional by preference with *habui*. Latin examples of the periphrastic formation of the future with *habeo* are given down to the ninth century. In this century, in the Strassburg oath, we find the first example of the Romance future, *salvarai* = *salvare habeo*, *prindrai* = *prendere habeo*. The whole investigation, which extends over a period of a thousand years of continuous development, is a model as to method, and the writer is justified in the emphasis which he lays upon the importance of the much-neglected ecclesiastical writings, both for the Latinist and the Romance scholar.

Fritz Schöhl discusses, pp. 203-218, "Alte Probleme." 1. Gerundium, concerning whose real meaning there has been so much disagreement, he regards as having simply the force of 'active' as opposed to supinum in the sense of 'passive.' In formation it is like *crepundia* from *crepere*. 2. The difficulties of the passage, *De Domo*, IX 24, he removes by considering 'leges Sempronias (per senatum decretas) rescidisti' an interpolation. 3. *opus est*—*usus est*. He seeks to prove that the construction of *usus est* with the abl. is really the earlier, and that *opus est* takes the abl. by the working of analogy, so that the case is not an instrumental nor a pure ablative. 4. *refert*—*interest*. The *rē* of *rēfert* is regarded not as a dat. or acc., but an abl., after the analogy of expressions like 'ex re esse,' 'ex re facere,' i. e., *refert* = 'vom standpunkt deiner Sache trägt es etwas aus' oder 'bringt es etwas ein.' The abl. after *interest* is due to false analogy. An attempt is made to explain the genitive construction after *interest* by supposing that in sentences like Cicero, pro Mur. II 4, *quantum salutis communis intersit*, Epist. IV 10, 2, *multum interest rei familiaris tuae*, etc., the genitive originally depended on *quantum*, *multum*, and was afterward regarded as independent of them. The last word, we think, yet remains to be said on this idiom.

E. Lübbert, pp. 219-227, contributes some interesting "Paralipomena zur Geschichte der lateinischen Tempora und Modi." Noticing the frequency with which in laws after the period of the Gracchi such double expressions of

time as *qui fecit, fecerit, qui emit emerit* occur, he seeks to explain the difficult passage, pro Sestio, 64, 133, *qui legem meam contemnat, quae dilucide vetat, gladiatores biennio, quo quis petierit aut petiturus sit, dare*, by supposing that the law itself read, *ne quis biennio, quo petiit petierit petiturus sit, gladiatorum munus edito*, the *petiturus sit* being added to include the last portion of the *biennium* and to prevent any legal quibbling. Lübbert shows that forms in *sim* like *faxim, capsim, servassim*, etc., always refer to events or actions conceived of as taking place in the future, all the alleged cases where a past action is implied being now satisfactorily disposed of by critics. *Coromagister*, in the inscription VITA DONATO CORO MAGISTRO, is explained by Wölfflin to be a hybrid after the analogy of κοροπλάστης.

Usener, pp. 228-232, develops the technical juristic meaning of *precator*. The *precator* stood to the slave in the same attitude as the *patronus* to the *clients* or *libertus*. A similar Greek use of παράκλητος is illustrated by several passages.

E. Hoffmann takes *speculoclarus*, in Most. 645, to be a compound adjective = 'spiegelhell.'

Wölfflin, pp. 233-254, tries to answer for different periods of Latinity the question "Was heisst bald . . . bald?" The early Latin seems to be poor in expressions of temporal corresponsion. It has no equivalent for the μέν . . . δέ so much used in Greek. Plautus, Curc. 63, uses *alias . . . alias*, but Terence, Eun. 714, already has the Ciceronian *modo . . . modo*, which Priscian explains by *nunc . . . nunc*. Cato uses *repente . . . repente* and *alteras . . . alteras* . . . *alteras*, for *alias*, p. 85, 3, Jordan. Rare examples of *dum . . . dum* are given. *Alias . . . alias* is used by Varro, and, what is stranger, by Caesar, although Sallust rejected it, and it continued to be used by Festus, Vitruvius, Seneca, Pliny, and Gellius, and even Quintilian. Occasional instances are pointed out in the jurists and late writers. The examples of *modo . . . modo* in all periods after Cicero are, of course, very numerous. Cicero prefers it in his speeches and letters, yielding the preference in his rhetorical works to *tum . . . tum*. Noticeable in Sallust is the chiasmic arrangement *citus modo modo tardus incessus*, which found few imitators. Ovid heaps up the *modo's* to excess. Vergil avoids them entirely.

Tum . . . tum seems first to have been used by Cicero = the earlier *dum . . . dum* (Cornificius, 3, 24, had used *modo . . . tum*), but it is remarkable how little acceptance it met with until Quintilian, who uses it fourteen times. Neither Pliny nor Tacitus followed their teacher in this usage. African writers indulged more frequently in its use. Apuleius is the first to use *tunc . . . tunc*, but *tum . . . tum* never became a favorite usage.

Nunc . . . nunc seems to have been introduced by Lucretius, and extended in use by Vergil and subsequent poets. Livy introduced it in prose, using it more frequently than *modo . . . modo*; but Tacitus uses *nunc . . . nunc* but once, *modo . . . modo* 25 times. Other interesting statistics are given.

Interdum . . . interdum first found in Cicero, Epist. ad Fam. 7, 17, 1, is followed by many examples from other writers.

iam . . . iam is introduced by Vergil, but never became popular in prose or poetry.

saepe . . . saepe is an innovation of Ovid which found slight following.

Celsus begins in his fifth book, for variety's sake, to use *nonnunquam* . . . *nonnunquam*, but this was too clumsy for general adoption.

aliquando . . . *aliquando* found much more favor with writers from Seneca on, and is especially frequent in the grammarians and some of the Church Fathers, although Hieronymus did not allow himself to use it. *aliquoties* . . . *aliquoties* comes into use much later.

alicubi . . . *alicubi* is almost confined to Seneca, its inventor. Examples are given also of *alibi* . . . *alibi, quando(que)* . . . *quando(que), interim* . . . *interim, subinde* . . . *subinde, plerumque* . . . *plerumque*, and *mox* . . . *mox*, all of which are for the most part late. The article, which is very suggestive, concludes with a mention of some variations such as *modo* . . . *saepius, modo* . . . *rursus, modo, modo* . . . *tum*, etc.

Several instances of the form *carrum* are given from glosses.

Paul Geyer, pp. 255-266, "Die Hisperica Famina." This article is devoted to an exposition of the peculiarities of the remarkable work first published under the above title in Angelo Mai's "Classici Auctores," Vol. V, pp. 479-500. Many indications are discovered of a Spanish origin. The date of composition is left undetermined. The reference to rhetorical schools, to which the work evinces a violent hostility, makes plausible the supposition that it belongs to the sixth or seventh century.

Pp. 267-275 contain Addenda lexicis latinis from *Barrichus-Curvedo*. Konrad Hoffman, in a note, defends the form *acieris*, Paulus, p. 10, 1, from which come Fr. *acier*, Ital. *acciaio*, Span. *acero*, against *acceris* found in Gloss. Philox, pp. 11, 32. The Cod. Sangallensis 912, A 82, has *acerlis*, which also favors *acieris*.

In pp. 276-288, Gröber continues his "Vulgärlateinische Substrata romanischer Wörter" from *ēber, ēbrius-filicūm, ficātūm = ficatūm*. A fourth specimen of the projected Thesaurus follows, which is less interesting than any of those preceding, being mostly devoted to *abba, abbas*. The rest of the number is devoted to short "Miscellen," including a short extract from the Phillipps Glossary, by Robinson Ellis, of which a larger specimen is presented to the readers of this Journal in the current number, and to book notices of works appearing in 1884, 1885.

M. WARREN.

FLECKEISEN'S JAHRBÜCHER FÜR CLASSISCHE PHILOLOGIE. 1883.¹

Fascicle I.

1. Zu den griechischen elegikern. This is a review by W. Clemm (Giessen) of the fourth edition of Bergk's second volume of the 'Poetae Lyrici Graeci.' It is a great misfortune that B. did not live to complete this volume himself; for he had kept fully abreast of the great mass of literature which continued to appear on the Greek elegiac poets since 1866. There is little to criticise in the text of Kallinos, Tyrtaios or Mimnermos, as B. has edited them. C. places Kallinos in the second half of the seventh cent. and Archilochos before him, thus reversing B.'s order. B. does not adopt several proposed emendations for the text of Solon, and against the new fever for responses and symmetry in Solon's poems, he takes decided ground. Upon Theognis, however, more

¹ See A. J. P. VI, p. 386.

has been written than upon all other Greek elegiac writers. It is and will be a disputed question, in spite of the most acute research, just how much of a Theognis collection is genuine. Thus, in fragments 467-474, 667-682, 1345-1350 we have B. ascribing them to Euenos. Leutsch ascribes the first to Panyasis and the second to Euenos, while Hiller, reasoning from the Euboean character of v. 672, ascribes vv. 891-894 to the same source. The question regarding the lemma (Ξενοφώντος), vv. 183-192, is still open. Clemm, following neither Sitzler nor Leutsch, but Bergk, explains it thus: A selection was made from Xenophon by Stobaios; this dropped out later in some way; after it came (Ἀριστοτέλους) ἐκ τοῦ περὶ (εὐγενείας). The beginning and end of this title were then lost. Ξενοφώντος fell into the place of Ἀριστοτέλους; in place of εὐγενείας came the initial word of the Aristotelian quotation. The review closes with a notice of B.'s treatment of the epigram found in §289 of Demosth. περὶ τοῦ στεφάνου.

2. Zu der schrift vom Staat der Athener. Schroeder, Berlin. In 3, 12 omit ἀδίκως both times.

3. Zu Empedokles. Blass, Kiel. Four critical and exegetical notes.

4. A review, by Ch. Muff (Stettin), of Wecklein's Chorgesänge des Aeschylus. This follows Wecklein's entirely new treatment of the Aeschylean choral songs step by step. W. takes up first the choral songs that have no antistrophes, then the ephymnia, and finally the division and the relation of the parts of the choral songs. As to W.'s work on the ephymnia, Muff gives Kirchhoff the honor of all originality; as to rhythmic ephymnia, Kruse, in his commentary to the Hiketides, was the first to explain them. W.'s rule that the strophal and antistrophal of the ephymnia are always sung by the same person or persons is not correct. They *may* be, and in Prom. 574-608 they are not. Muff's own views are more fully given in his 'de choro Persarum.'

5. Zu Euripides. F. L. Lentz, Königsberg. Hartung and Kirchhoff have omitted *τί φῶ* in Eurip. Hel. 656, because these words destroy the stichomythia. G. Hermann arranged the text in lines 704-705 so that *τί φῆς* made a line by itself. L. points out that there is no stichomythia near v. 656 for it to destroy, and proposes a better analysis of the thought in vv. 704, 705 than Hermann's, so that *τί φῆς* may be incorporated into a full line. The general drift of the article, however, is to show the superiority of Hermann's work in Euripides, and to answer the many objections against the texts of Kirchhoff, Nauck and Dindorf by inviting closer attention to Hermann's.

6. A note zur biographie des Thukydides. Hirschwälder, Breslau.

7. Der letzte kampf der Achäer gegen Nabis. F. Ruhl, Königsberg.

8. Epigraphisches. P. Cauer, Berlin. A note to correct a statement, p. 319, in Vol. IV Leipzig Studien; for *παράγωνται*, the proposed reading, substitute *παραγγ[έλλ]ωνται*. In the Revue Archéologique, VIII, p. 469, for *τιμαῖει* read *τετιμά[κ]ει*.

9. Zu Florus. Teuber, Eberswalde. In I 37 read *venere illi*; *quanta* et in barbaris *animi* alti vestigia, etc.

10. A review by Meltzer of Pais's *La Sardegna prima del dominio romano*. The book discusses early Egyptian, Libyan and Phoenician migrations to

Sardinia. The review is very favorable. Meltzer takes occasion, however, to show at length where he disagrees with G. F. Unger on the same subject.

11. *Zum Truculentus des Plautus.* Dziatzko, Breslau. An explanation of the superscription to act II, sc. 1. Whether the VL after the period shall be taken for a numeral is discussed. Schöll properly compares this with LX at the end of act II, sc. 1 in *Trin.*, but considers the V and the X to be musical symbols. D. takes both for numerals and shows with one parallel instance that VL can = 45. Besides, in the *Cod. Vet.* this very act has 45 lines. Three notes on *Trin.* (vv. 2, 248 and 882) end the article.

12. *Zur kritik des Propertius.* Rossberg, Norden. From a study of the five MSS (AFDVN), R. comes to a series of seven conclusions, the most important of which is that N has a far greater value than Baehrens has recently given it in his edition.¹ R. then adds his critical and exegetical notes on I 1, 7; I 3, 37; I 4, 7; I 6, 24; I 7, 16; I 8, 40; I 9, 6; I 11, 6; I 19, 10; I 20, 25 ff.; II 1, 6; II 3, 22 and 25 other passages.

13. *Ein druckfehler bei Ovidius.* Brandt, Heidelberg. The passage is in Merkel's edition; *Trist.* IV 10, 107.

14. *Zu Xenophon's Hellenika.* H. Zurborg, Zerbst. Critical notes on I 1, 36; II 1, 15; II 3, 19; II 3, 40.

Fascicle 2.

15. *Anzeige von A. Boetticher's Olympia*, by J. Classen, Hamburg. Since Classen reviewed Curtius' *Peloponnesus* (Vol. 67 Jgbr.) he has himself been in *Olympia* (April, 1880). The ground is familiar to him, and it is with a positive sense of joy that, comparing his impressions of the "*Olympia*" with his recollections of the place, he gives Bötticher's work a hearty indorsement. In 1875 B. was sent out to *Olympia* with Prof. G. Hirschfeld to conduct the archaeological and technical work in connection with the excavations. It is as a result of the sympathetic encouragement of E. Curtius, Hirschfeld and Weil that this volume has appeared. The introduction (pp. 3-11) explains the standpoint which the author takes for his work. The next division (pp. 15-25) treats of the geographical position and surroundings of *Olympia*; another is devoted to the decline of *Olympia* and the late history of the plain (pp. 29-45). Very interesting is the chapter on the history of the rediscovery of *Olympia* (pp. 49-72). The following chapter (pp. 79-154) on the festivals in *Olympia* is somewhat out of connection with the main purpose of the work—which is to show the results of the German excavations in *Olympia*. Then follows the most important part of the work—namely, an historical account of the scenes through which *Olympia* passed from the earliest time to the Roman hegemony. This period he divides into four parts, running the history of *Olympia* through them in succession. Pages 243-337 are devoted to the period when the city

¹ See Robinson Ellis in *A. J. P.* I 389. It is of interest to quote what E. says (p. 401): "The conclusion at which I have arrived is that N is *not* an interpolated MS; that it stands on a level, as regards sincerity, with Bährens' four primary codices; that the same arguments which are used to prove it interpolated might be turned against a variety of readings in these four MSS; that, as a corollary to this, the archetype which Bährens would reconstitute from these four is only partially to be accepted." Rossberg does not agree with E. as to the freedom of N from interpolations, but in the practical conclusion he is at one with him. No reference is made to E.'s article.—B. L. G.

was at her highest—from the Persian to the Makedonian war. The whole work, in conclusion, meets with Classen's heartiest approbation and his warmest recommendation.

16. Zu Sophokles' *Antigone*. Petri, Hörter. A critical note on 150 ff.

17. Die *ἀπαγωγή* in mordprocessen. M. Sorof, Coslin. We have but few means for arriving at a conception of the *ἀπαγωγή*—namely, in Lys. c. Antiphon V, Lysias XIII, and Demosthenes XXIII. Arguing from the fact that in Agoratum the eleven cannot take cognizance of the accusation for murder before the clause *ἐπ' αὐτοφώρῳ* is added, and from the fact that in Ant. V the accused does not complain of being brought up before the eleven because the clause is not inserted, but because the trial was held *ἐν τῇ ἀγορᾷ* and not *ἐν ὑπαίθρῳ*, S. comes to the conclusion that the eleven did not have cognizance of all murder trials at Lysias' time, and that at the time of Antiphon the clause *ἐπ' αὐτοφώρῳ* was not essential. The speech of Antiphon on the murder of Herodes is no proof that at his time trials for simple murder could come off before the eleven. If a murderer was conveyed to prison, another charge (thievery) must be made against him, so that he might fall under the *νόμος κακούργων*. Later the competence of the eleven was extended to such cases wherein the charge was for simple murder, but the murderer was caught *ἐπ' αὐτοφώρῳ*.

18. Zu Timon von Phlius. F. Kern, Berlin.

19. Das halsband der Harmonia und die krone der Ariadne. W. Schwartz, Posen. The necklace of Harmonia was eventually sunk in a Greek fountain. *Hodie cerni dicitur, quod si quis attraxerit, dicunt solem offendi et tempestatem oriri*. This gives S. occasion to treat the whole matter on the basis of comp. mythology. The necklace is compared with the Nibelungenhort, which also, being of baneful magic powers, was sunk to rid the world of it. The necklace of Harmonia is, further, the same as the rainbow—the girdle of the heavenly waters. The appearance of the rainbow is also baneful. Sophokles calls it *οὐράνιον ἄχος*. In Iliad P 548 we read of it as a *τέρας ἢ πολέμοιο ἢ καὶ χεϊμῶνος δυσθαλπέος*. As the Nibelungenhort lies in the water and that of Andvari is rescued from the water, so the necklace remains sunk there, while Theseus brings up the crown of Ariadne. S. then goes on to show that all these treasures are connected with the storms in the waters of the clouds. These treasures, as well as Indra's bow, the water-ring in Switzerland, the crown of the goddess of the spring-sun of the Harz, all come from some common original source.

20. Zu Lucianos. J. Sommerbrodt, Breslau. Fortsetzung von Jahrgang 1878, pp. 561–564. Critical notes.

21. Zu Cicero's reden gegen Verres. E. Grunauer, Winterthur. Note on IV, §41.

22. Quisquilliae Plautinae. Th. Hasper, Dresdae. Critical notes on Men. 519 and Aulularia.

23. M. Wetzel. Anzeige v. H. Kluges *consecutio temporum* im latein. Kluge has given little that is new, although in a great deal that he gives he seems correct enough. Gossrau (lateinische sprachlehre) and Wetzel himself (de cons. temp. Ciceroniana capita duo) have as good as exhausted the field.

- 24. Zu Seneca. E. Heydenreich, Freiberg. On de remediis fortuitorum.
- 25. Inschrift von Metapontion. E. Hiller, Halle.

Fascicle 3.

26. Zu Sophokles. J. Renner, Zittau. Ten critical notes, seven on Philoktetes, two on Trachiniai, one on Aias.

27. Die vergiftung mit stierblut im classischen altertum. W. Roscher, Wurzen. R. shows, with eight classified instances, the general belief in this kind of poisoning; shows, however, that to-day physicians, and especially American physicians, give ox-blood to their patients at times, and suggests that the ancient superstition may have arisen from some one's having drunk the blood of an ox suffering from inflammation of the spleen.

28. Utra futuri forma oratores attici uti maluerint, ἐξω an σχῆσω? E. R. Schultze, Bautzen. "I have found ἐξω to have been the much more common form and σχῆσω to have been almost entirely unused excepting in κατέχευω." A statistical table follows.

29. Die gegner in der ersten rede des Isaïos. Albrecht, Berlin.

30. Die weihinschrift des Dianahaines von Aricia. This is directed against O. Seck's article, Rh. Mus. XXXVII 15-25, who dates the inscription 381 B. C. Beloch gives it a much older date. It has to do rather with the Latin confederation than with the Alban, and all the states mentioned in it must have been independent; for the dictator of Latium is named at the very beginning. Pometia, however, which is included among the states, lost its independence about the beginning of the Volscian war. That would place the inscription not far from 490 B. C.

31. Zu Justinus. A. Eussner, Würzburg, and Sprenger, Northeim.

32. Th. Vogel's anzeige von K. Sittl's lokalen verschiedenheiten der lat. spr. This book, which is, upon the whole, rather new in its field, makes a good beginning, and it is to be hoped other investigators will be attracted to continue what it has begun.

(13.) Ein druckfehler bei Ovidius. Goebel, Fulda. Two additional internal reasons in support of Art. 13 above.

33. Pseudoboethiana. Stangl, München. Critical notes. Continued in fascicle 4.

34. Zu Cicero's Brutus. A. Fleckeisen, Dresden. Seven critical notes. A continuation is promised.

35. Zu Gellius. H. Rönsch, Lobenstein. Critical notes on XVI 7.

36. Sallustius und Aurelius Victor. Th. Opitz, Dresden. This comes in support of Wölfflin, Rh. Mus. XXIX 285 ff., showing how much Aur. Victor imitated the style of Sallust. O. carries his instances beyond the 11th chap. of the Caesar, where Wölfflin stopped. O. shows, further, that this imitation went so far that Aur. Vic. copied and used over and over certain pet words and phrases found in Sallust.

37. Zenon von Kition. F. Susemihl, Greifswald. A note to Rohde; see Jahrb. 1882, 773 ff. and 831 ff.

38. Zu Livius. Eisen, Lörrach. On XXII 3, 6, read *Faesus cedens* for *F. petens*.

Fascicle 4.

39. Studien zu Babrios und den Aisoepia. O. Crusius, Leipzig.

40. Zur Erklärung und Kritik der homerischen Gedichte. A. Gemoll, Wohlauf. Von homerischen Zahlen. First, ships of twenty and of fifty oars are not pure invention. In v. 322 we read, "we likened it [the Kyklops' club] to the mast of a twenty-oared vessel"; this plainly implies the existence of such vessels. So do A 309, β 212, δ 669. Mention of fifty-oared boats occurs in B 719 and II 170, also in B 662; for from γ 7, where 9×500 Pylians sacrifice with Nestor, we may infer they were really 90×50 . γ 7 was composed before B 510, for in the latter, ships of 120 men occur, which number must be mentally carried on to v. 719. Had this catalogue been before the composer of γ 7, he would have given figures differing from those actually given. Secondly, the number 9. The arrows of the god fell 9 days (A 53), nine heralds arrange the Achaeans (B 96), nine battle-judges arrange the Phaiakians (θ 258). See also Z 174, I 474, M 25, ω 60. Here 9 is an imaginary number. But where burial is alluded to (Ω 664, 610, 107, 413) it is not so; we have traces of a very ancient usage. It is historically the same as *énata* and the *sacrum novendiale*. Finally, the 118 goats (ι 159) and the 118 suitors (π 247).

41. Zu Theognis. Ziegler, Stuttgart. Critical notes in continuation of Jhbb. 1882, p. 447.

42. Das Thronfolgerecht der spartanischen Kronprinzenöhne (zu Herod. VII 3). G. Heidtmann, Wesel. An argument to prove that the passage (Herod. VII 3) *ἔπει γε καὶ ἐν Σπάρτῃ . . . βασιλῆως γίνεσθαι* is the interpolation of a later hand.

43. Zu Platon's apologie des Sokrates. E. Goebel, Fulda. A continuation of Jhbb. 1882, pp. 747-750. Critical notes on §35b through §41b.

44. O. Harnecker's anzeige von C. Jacoby's Anthologie aus den elegikern der Römer. J. has done much better work on his second volume (Tibullus and Propertius) than on the first (Ovid and Catullus). H. questions the real usefulness of the first, therefore. The second is a decided improvement over Schulze. A new edition will give opportunity for many improvements.

45. Zu Ovidius Fasti. W. Gilbert, Dresden. In Jhbb. 1878, p. 784, line 15, verses 803 and 804 are spoken of where G. meant verses 804 and 805. This misprint has given rise to considerable error already.

46. Das fragmentum Cuiacianum des Tibullus. E. Hiller, Halle. This fragment (F) was used by the Italians in the 15th century. Most of its readings, which differ from our best MSS, especially from the Ambrosianus, are brought in from interpolated readings, from old editions and from old collations.

47. B. Dombart's anzeige von Ennodii opera omnia ed. G. Hartel.

48. Zu Livius und Aelius Spartianus. J. Golisch, Schweidnitz. A note on *non utique* in Livy VII 40, 9; and on *post maceriem* (MSS *post maurum*, Peter, *post murum*) Spartianus, Severus XXII 4.

(33.) Pseudo-boethiana. Th. Stangl. Continuation from fascicle 3.

49. Wisibada, J. G. Cuno, Graudenz. Von Medem derives this name (mod. Wiesbaden) from the Irish *uisge* = water. C. takes it from the tribal name Usinobates, which is a contraction from Nava (= naba) and *ós* = supra; so that the name stands for **ós-i-noba-tes* = supra Navam habitantes. Long o we know passed over, in the old Celtic, to ua, which gives the w sound.

50. Philologische gelegenheitsschriften.

Fascicles 5 u. 6.

51. Die orakelinschriften von Dodona. H. R. Pomtow, Hamburg. This article covers the first 55 pages of this double number, and is mainly devoted to a more intelligent and systematic study of the leaden plates found at Dodona than they received at the hands of Carapanos (Dodone et ses ruines, Paris, Hachette et cie., 1878, 2 t.). Carapanos' work has not given to the study of Dodonian antiquities that impetus which they merit. Apart from minor contributions, such as those of Eggers (bull. de corr. hel. Vol. I), of Rangabé (Parnassos II 5, p. 399, and Arch. u. epig. beiträge aus Oest IV (1880) p. 59) of Garlitt and Schneider (in the same pp. 61-64), we have but three really important treatises on these inscriptions: Wieseler's (Gött. nachrich. 1879, 1-79), Bursian (sitz. ber. d. Münch. Akad. 1878, phil.-hist. cl. 1-29, nachtr. p. 224), and Köhler (der neue reich, 1879, p. 407 ff.). Pomtow reclassifies the inscriptions, finding as he does no system in Carapanos' classification. The total number (45) which C. gives, he reduces to 41, since some of the plates go together. P. arranges in the first class those questions directed to the oracle by the various Greek states, giving with each inscription the restoration and a commentary where necessary. First come the two plates containing questions asked by Korkyra, then one from Tarentum, another from the Molossae. In the second class are put questions asked by private people. Nos. 6 and 7 are the antiquissimae; after these come the Dorian and Aeolian; with No. 22 begin the Athenian and Ionian. Then follow 13 very fragmentary and illegible inscriptions, of which P. makes the most he can; the four illegible inscriptions are arranged last, and in an appendix come the most recently discovered plates. The second part of the article is devoted to the main discussion: of what significance these inscriptions are for our knowledge of the arrangements of a Dodonian oracle and what place these plates had in it. First, the topography of the country is carefully gone over, and every deduction made which helps toward the reconstruction of the old sacred spot. From Polyb. IV 67 we learn that Dorimachos *κατέσκαψε καὶ τὴν ἱερὰν οἰκίαν*, but from Diodoros that he *τὸ μαντεῖον σὺλῃσας ἐνέπρησε τὸ ἱερὸν πλὴν τοῦ σηκοῦ*. P. takes the *σηκός* or *μαντεῖον* to be the space—the inner sanctuary—which was surrounded with the famous three tripods. And as to the leaden tablets, a great many of them came from the old archives destroyed by Dorimachos. The location of this archive-chamber P. takes to be one of the two stone buildings erected on the plateau of the temple-enclosure, and never reconstructed in later times. Such a locality we must assume as the place for preservation, and if the building which lay nearer the temple was the *θησαυρός*, then the more remote one was the archive-building or vice versa. When the oracle was restored, the temple only was rebuilt; however, fragments of the old registered plates were found in the other ruins, and they were conveyed to the temple, which was

now used as an archive-building, and in whose ruins Carapanos found them. Here the question-plates were stored up as fast as used, and the older ones (dating from the time of Dorimachos) began to be used over. The broken condition of the old plates is due to his plundering the temple—a condition which compelled the writers who used these plates over to adapt the endings and the beginnings of their lines to the irregularities of the edges.

52. Die einföhrung der in homerischer zeit noch nicht bekannten opfer in Griechenland. P. Stengel, Berlin. The article has special reference to expiatory and mortuary sacrifices, neither of which S. maintains was known to the Homeric Greeks. To the first belong human sacrifices, and these, says K. F. Hermann, were known to the oldest Greek cultus, beyond all doubt. The first argument is directed against this statement. S. agrees with Hermann that the Phoenicians would have been the people from whom these sacrifices were learned. But the Phoenicians practised them only at the beginning of a great undertaking or upon the opening of a campaign, whereas there is no great concurrent evidence that the Greeks, with all their knowledge of human sacrifices, performed them on these occasions. S. comes to the conclusion that expiatory sacrifices, especially human sacrifices, were borrowed from the Phoenicians, and found entrance into Greece *long after* Homer, when commerce between the two peoples was more active. The second argument touches sacrifices to the dead. S. holds the ground that there is no single instance of Greek sacrifices to the dead where any trace of foreign influence can be discovered; the case of the Scythian Toxaris (Herod. IV 61) being of course totally un-Hellenic. Sacrifices accompanying the taking of oaths take the last three pages of the article. The aim of the entire article is to maintain that modifications in the conceptions of the Hellenic deities are all post-Homeric.

53. Zu Antiphon. E. Albrecht, Berlin. Ten critical and exegetical notes.

54. Zu Archimedes. F. Blass, Kiel. In the *Ψαμμίτης*, L, §9 (II 248 Heiberg), it is proposed to change *Ἀκούπατρος* to *ἀμὸν πατρός = τοῦ ἡμετέρου πατρός*.

55. Die regierungen des Peisistratos. G. F. Unger, Würzburg. U. distinguishes four periods during which Peisistratos controlled Athens:

Oly. 54, 4 = 561, 1st $\frac{1}{2}$ year; 54, 4 = 560, exile 8 years.

56, 4 = 552, 2d $\frac{1}{2}$ year; 57, 1 = 552, exile, 1 year.

57, 2 = 551, 3d 7 years; 58, 4 = 544, exile 7 years.

60, 3 = 537, 4th 9 years; 62, 4 = 528, died.

56. Über den schluss des zweiten Epeisodion in Sophokles' Antigone. F. Kern, Berlin. Mainly a psychological analysis of the entire close of this epeisodion, with an incidental discussion of the question whether v. 572 ought not to be given to Ismene.

57. Philologie und geschichtswissenschaft, von H. Usener. A few objections by F. Heerdegen, Erlangen, to Usener's definition of the relation of philology to historical knowledge and those sciences which are grouped under general psychology.

58. Zu Epikuros brief an Herodotos. F. Bockemüller, Stade.

59. Zu Quintilianus. A. Eussner, Würzburg. In *Inst. Orat.* XII 10, 64,

E. would omit *verborum*, because it mars the effect, and can belong to only one member of the comparison.

60. Zu Dionysios von Halikarnasos. Critical notes (7) by L. Sadée, Freiburg im Br.

61. *Λήμματα εἰς τὰ σφαιρικά*. F. Hultsch, Dresden.

62. Zu Ovidius metamorphosen. E. Grunauer, Winterthur. In IX 43, read *pectus* for *pronus*.

63. Zu Cicero's philosophischen schriften. W. Friedrich, Mühlhausen, in Th. Critical Notes.

(21.) Zu Cicero's reden gegen Verres. J. Schlenger, Mainz. Read *aprinum* for *parinum* in IV, §128.

64. W. H. Kolster's anzeige v. Virgil, with notes by T. L. Papillon.

65. Zu Sallustius. K. Kraut, Blaubeuren. In *hist. fr.* I 56 Kr. read *nimis securam* for *omissa cura*.

W. E. WATERS.

ENGLISCHE STUDIEN. Herausgegeben von Dr. EUGEN KÖLBING. VI Band. Heilbronn, 1883.¹

I.—Noticeable among the articles of this volume is one On the Sources of the Ormmulum, by G. Sarrazin. The starting-point of his investigation is furnished him by the statements of two authorities, White, the editor of the Ormmulum, and Ten Brink. The former says of Orm: "He borrows copiously from the writings of St. Augustine and Aelfric, and occasionally from those of Beda"; the latter affirms (Early English Literature, p. 194): "Orm's theological tradition went back to Aelfric and his school. He seems quite at home in Aelfric's writings, as well as in those of Beda and Augustine." Sarrazin sets himself the task of testing the accuracy of these statements, and arrives at the conclusion that Orm's principal authority is Beda and the homilies of Gregory the Great, but that he may also have consulted the writings of Josephus (Hegesippus) and Isidor. As to any direct influence of Augustine, Jerome or Aelfric, there is no testimony whatsoever. Moreover, Orm is totally unaffected, not only by the Norman-French language, but also by the influx of foreign theological thought, as represented by Anselm and by Berengarius of Tours.

W. Sattler, Zur englischen Grammatik, IV, discusses the relation of *older* *oldest* to *elder*, *eidest*.

Notes on Macaulay's History, IV, by R. Thum.

G. Sarrazin, in a paper On the Etymology of "Bad," proposes O. E. *gebáded* as its root. It should be observed, however, that the Dictionary of the Philological Society prefers *bæddel*, which Zupitza has suggested as the probable etymon.

The Book Notices contain reviews of Morris' Specimens of Early English, Part I, Zeuner's Die Sprache des Kentischen Psalters, Landmann's Shakspeare and Euphuism, Moltke's Shakspeare's Hamlet-Quellen, and Zart's Einfluss

¹ See A. J. P. V 126.

der englischen Philosophie seit Bacon auf die deutsche Philosophie des 18 Jahrhunderts.

The department of Lehr- und Uebungsbücher für die englische Sprache occupies pp. 114-148. The Miscellanea contain a paper by James Platt on Old English Declension, in the form of additions and emendations to Sievers' Angelsächsische Grammatik.

II.—An important paper is the initial one of this part, entitled The Figurative Mode of Expression in Beowulf and the Edda. The author, A. Hoffmann, presents the opposing views of Heinzel, Ueber den Stil der altgermanischen Poesie (Strassburg, 1875), and of Gummere, The Anglo-Saxon Metaphor, Halle, 1881, and points out the inconsistencies into which the latter is betrayed. No theory of the O. E. metaphor which ignores Norse figures of speech can possibly be tenable. The style of the Edda is then compared with that of Beowulf, and we are led to perceive that in the former it is the imagination which is dominant, while in the latter it is sentiment. Now, the imagination loves the concrete, while sentiment is eminently vague and unplastic, forgetting the external world and immersed in itself. Hoffmann virtually agrees with Heinzel, then, in attributing the O. E. loss of the Germanic simile to the elegiac feeling, the reflectiveness and melancholy which were innate in the Englishman, and were to be still further intensified by Christianity. A compensation for this loss is nevertheless discoverable in the creation of a vigorous rhetorical style, full of a movement and opulence of its own, which rendered the employment of imagery in a measure superfluous. Not to be overlooked are the classified lists of rhetorical figures from the two poems, which are appended to the article proper.

G. Wendt closes his Treatment of English Prepositions in the Realschule of the first class with this, the seventh instalment.

The departments of Book Notices, Lehr- und Uebungsbücher, and Programmschau, are represented as usual. The Miscellanea present some important notes by James Platt, entitled Additions to Sievers' O. E. Grammar. The number ends with a Zeitschriftenschau.

III.—K. Elze contributes Last Notes on 'Mucedorus,' occupying pp. 311-321.

Friedrich Kluge discusses the O. E. poem of the *Seafarer* in the first of a series of papers headed On Old English Poems. He assents to Rieger's theory (Zacher's Zeitschrift, I 334-339) of a dialogue between father and son in vv. 1-64. But Rieger seeks to compress the whole poem, including the homiletic portion at the end, into the mould of this dialogue, and it is here that Kluge's opposition begins. Emphasizing the poetic insight and the comprehension of psychical situations and processes displayed in the first half of the poem, he undertakes to demonstrate the inferiority of the second, and to prove that it must be by another hand. Though Kluge sometimes betrays the animus of a special pleader, his article must be taken into account by every scholar who would discuss the poem in question.

Hermeneutical and Phraseological Notes on Tom Brown's Schooldays is the title of a paper by Otto Kares.

Notes on the Language of Carlyle, by M. Krummacher. This paper is indispensable to any one who desires to investigate Carlyle's linguistic peculiarities, and forms an admirable supplement to Minto's treatment in the latter's Manual of English Prose Literature.

Notes on Macaulay's History, V, by R. Thum.

K. Elze contributes three pages of notes on 'The Tempest.'

F. H. Stratmann, under the heading Etymological, discusses Mod. Engl. *chaff*, *gasp*, *blotch*, *scorch*, and *shoot*.

Kölbing publishes Collations, the works emended being The Proces of the Sevyn Sages, in Weber's Metrical Romances, III 8 ff., The Seven Sages, edited by Wright, Ein angelsächsisches leben des Neot, edited by Wülcker in Anglia III 104-114, and Wülcker's Altenglisches Lesebuch, Zweiter Theil.

W. Sattler, Zur englischen Grammatik, VI.

York Powell, A Few Notes on Sir Tristram.

The Book Notices and Miscellanea are much briefer than usual, pp. 465-479.

ALBERT S. COOK.

MNEMOSYNE, Vol. XII, Part 4.

In pp. 337-372 of this part Naber continues his "Homerica Posteriora." Before beginning to reduce to order his notes, made long ago, he tells us that he read the Iliad over again to see if he could discover any additional grounds for adhering to or for rejecting his suspicions. Even this last reading "non fuit sine fructu; veluti statim haesi ad A 46, quem locum millies sine offensione legeram." In the lines *ἐκλαγξαν δ' ἄρ' ὁστοὶ ἐπ' ὤμων Χωομένοιο | αὐτοῦ κινηθέντος · ὁ δ' ἤγε νυκτὶ ἐοικώς*, "primum hic offendit iteratum participium *Χωομένοιο* · jam enim dixerat poeta iratum deum esse, ac praeterea inutiliter irae mentio fit: haec enim non causa fuit cur sagittae clangorem ederent, sed ipsa celeritas, qua deus de Olympo desiluit. Neque iratus Apollo est Aen. IV 149 vel IX 660, cum *tela sonant humeris* vel Camilla Aen. XI 652. Etiam constructio laborat, quod interpretes frustra negant; audi modo: *αὐτοῦ κινηθέντος nicht mehr wie Χωομένοιο, von ὤμων abhängig, sondern in freierer Verbindung angefügt: so wie er sich selbst in Bewegung gesetzt*. Scilicet talia probantur, donec melius inventum fuerit." Zenodotus, indeed, whose authority "hodie pluris habetur, quam quo tempore omnes jurabant in Lehrsii verba," *ἠθέτησε* these two lines, partly no doubt offended by *νυκτὶ ἐοικώς*, for which he gave *νυκτὶ ἔλυσθεις*. Though the imitation in λ 606 shows that *ἐοικώς* is the true reading "contendo facilius esse admirari quam intelligere, quo illa Apollinis cum nocte comparatio pertineat . . . propemodum ridiculum est describere Apollinis imaginem, qui quantus erat totus noctis similis erat, neque a quoquam conspici poterat." A comparison of Δ 420, Ν 19, X 32 suggests that for *Χωομένοιο* we should read *ῥωομένοιο* "quo facto sequens versiculus sponte excidet . . . Talia cum videam, confirmatur mihi id quod saepe suspicatus sum, multa utilia etiam hodie inesse in Zenodoti lectionibus, quas si quis sine praejudicata opinione examinabit, etiam si verae non videantur esse, tamen viam monstrabunt, qua pergere quaerendo debemus." Then follow comments on about 110 passages in the Iliad, in many of which the reader is referred to "Quaestiones Homericae" for their justification: as on A 60, *εἰ κεν θάνατόν γε φύγομεν*:

"Lege: φύωμεν. Cf. Qu. Hom. p. 97." The same reference is given to support the reading ὅς εἶπρ for ὅς κ' εἶποι in A 66. On A 173, ἐνθάδ' ἄμιος ἐὼν ἀφενος καὶ πλοῦτον ἀφίξειν he says: "hic breviter Nauckius: ἀφύζειν *suspectum*. Concedo. Quid reponendum? Confer modo M 214 . . . unde ibidem requiro: ἀφενος καὶ πλοῦτον ἀέξειν, quod primum proclivi errore factum est ἀφέξειν, deinde ἀφίξειν." A 555: νῦν δ' αἰνῶς δεῖδοικα κατὰ φρένα μὴ σε παρείπῃ | ἀργυροπέζα Θέτις, "non opus est dicere cur Bentleius hic παρέλθῃ scribere voluerit, sed Herwerdenus, postquam lectissime observavit indicativum modum requiri, 'digamma' inquit 'tam saepe neglectum violentis remediis reducere plenum est opus aleae'; itaque satis habuit commendare παρείπεν. De indicativo modo concedo omnia itemque concedo Aeolicam literam non violentis remediis reducendam esse. Quid autem si lene remedium sufficit? Scribam: νῦν Σ' αἰνῶς δεῖδοικα κατὰ φρένα μὴ παραείπεν. Etiam Homerus sic loqui solet, veluti E 85: Τυδείδην δ' οὐκ ἂν γνῶις ποτέρωσι μετείῃ. I 191: δέγμενος Αἰακίδην, ὅπῃτε λήξειεν αἰείδων. Vide praeterea Σ 261 et Υ 311." On E 46, where Idomeneus is said to wound Phaestos ἵππων ἐπιβησόμενον κατὰ δεξιὸν ὦμον ἤριπε δ' ἐξ ὀχέων, he agrees with Herwerden that the partic. cannot have a future sense, "quum curru non possit excidere, qui eum nondum conscenderit"; but thinks him wrong in regarding it as an aor., "nec tamen amicus meus videtur animadvertisse horum aoristorum participia non fuisse in usu"; to confirm which he gives a full account of the words of that formation actually found. Referring to E 20 and Υ 401, where warriors abandon their chariots to escape danger, he conjectures that we should read ἀποβησόμενον, thinking that "locum de industria corruptum fuisse ut Zoilli reprehensio eluderetur," who, in his comment on E 20, says: λίαν γελοῖως πεποιήκεν ὁ ποιητὴς τὸν Ἰδαῖον ἀπολιπόντα τοὺς ἵππους καὶ τὸ ἄρμα φεύγειν ἡ δύνατο γὰρ μᾶλλον ἐπὶ τοῖς ἵπποις. These notes are well worth reading, though they by no means always secure assent to the opinion expressed.

The next article, pp. 373-377, is by J. J. Cornelissen on the second volume of Halm's fourth edition of Tacitus. In Hist. i 2, *Opus aggredior opimum casibus*, taking a hint from Ernesti, he proposes to read *Tempus aggredior horridum casibus*, referring for the use of this verb with *Tempus* in this sense to Plin. Ep. v. 8, 12. In Hist. i 72, where the end of Tigellinus is described, he would substitute *saevo per sero* in the sentence *sectis novacula faucibus infamem vitam foedavit etiam exitu sero et inhonesto*; and in iii 24 he would write *ignominiam consummastis* for *consumpsistis*. There are other changes suggested which are equally probable with these.

In pp. 378-392 Cobet concludes his notes on Stein's Herodotus, this article covering the ninth book. In c. 1 he finds another instance of the employment of καταλαμβάνειν in the sense he gave it in ii 162, οὐκ ἔαν ἱέναι ἑκαστέρῳ, the recognition of which enables him to get rid of certain "verba moleste interpretata." ix 4: εἵπε γνώμην ὥς ἐδόκεε ἄμεινον εἶναι δεξαμένους τὸν λόγον, τὸν σφι Μουρυχίδης προφέρει, ἐξενεῖκα ἐς τὸν δῆμον. "Qui sententiam dicit utitur verbis ἐμοὶ δοκεῖ, ἀλλὰ μοι δοκεῖ, nunquam sine pronomine. Itaque vera lectio est ὥς ΟΙ ἐδόκεε. Praeterea corrigendum ΠΡΟΣφέρει. Respondent enim sibi inter se λόγον προσφέρειν et τὸν λόγον δέχεσθαι vel ἐνδέχεσθαι. Cf. i 60: ἐκδεξαμένον δὲ τὸν λόγον . . . Πεισιστράτον. iii 134: ἡ Ἀτοσσα προσέφερε . . . τῷ Δαρεῖω λόγον τοιούδε. viii 52: οὐδὲ λόγους τῶν Πεισιστρατιδῶν προσφερόντων περὶ

ὁμολογῆς ἐνεδέκοντο. viii 100 . . . et aliis locis." The notes are throughout of this character, and do not offer much that is of special interest. On ix 53, *λοχηγέων τοῦ Πιτανητέων λόχων*, where he says "certa est Koenii emendatio Πιτανητέω ut paullo inferius ἀπολιπεῖν τὸν λόγον τὸν Πιτανήτην," he again charges Thucydides with having misunderstood Herodotus. In this case "fuerat in illo bello cohors, quae quum tota ἐκ Πιτανητέων constaret, optime ὁ Πιτανήτης λόχος appellabatur, neque inde sequitur in Spartanorum exercitu semper cohortem eo nomine fuisse." As to the assumed double vote of the Spartan kings, his opinion is here more clearly expressed than it was on vi 57. "hoc Herodotus dixit: si DUO reges in curia non adessent, ex Senatorum numero UNUM proxime iis cognatum pro *duobus* regibus absentibus DUO suffragia ferre suumque TERTIUM. Itaque reges singuli sive praesentes sive absentes singula suffragia in curia ferebant. Poterat Herodotus scribere: ΤΟΝ μάλιστα σφί τῶν γερόντων προσήκοντα et sic nihil fuisset ambigui, sed quia non de duobus certis regibus sed de omnibus cogitabat, maluit dicere τοὺς μάλιστα σφί τῶν γερόντων προσήκοντας, quae res Thucydidem in errorem induxit."

C. M. Francken continues, pp. 393-404, his notes *ad Ciceronis Palimpsestos*. He says: "ad singulos locos non tantum notabo ea quae librariorum mendis corrupta sunt, sed etiam si usu veniat, quae ipsius auctoris errore minus recte se habere videntur, velut statim: i. 'non duo Scipiones oriens incendium belli Punici secundi sanguine suo restinxissent.' Parum recte haec dicta sunt, quasi duo Scipiones in Hispania initio belli Punici secundi cecidissent ante pugnam Cannensem et Fabii dictaturam: P. et Cn. Cornelii Scipiones duobus fere annis post pugnam Cannensem in Hispania nobili morte inclaruerunt, cum P. initio belli ad Ticinum et Trebiam victus esset, neque alter inclaruisset." On a passage in which C. F. W. Müller reads *sint* in a relative clause, where *sunt* is given by the editors generally, there is a long and useful note. "Est sane externa quaedam inaequalitas multis locis, non tamen ea, ut mutatae constructionis ratio lateat; quae si nulla sit, deserendos codices puto." After citing many examples where the difference of the indicative and subjunctive is slight but perceptible, he concludes: "res tum potissimum difficilis est, si certam normam desideres; neque enim ad numeros revocari potest; sentimus tamen usu docti uter modus sit aptior, etsi rationes dare subinde difficile est, sentimus varias quasi modulationes elocutionis, maiorem minorem fiduciam loquentis; discrimen inter relativa definitiva et qualitativa animadvertimus singulis paene locis; aliis, ubi uterque modus sententia non alienus est, codices omne momentum habent, a quibus propter legem aliquam subtiliter a grammaticis excogitatam non temere recedendum est. In eo assentior Mullero."

In the next article, pp. 405-432, we have more *Herodotea* from Herwerden. He tells us that after having in 1883 published a critical commentary on books I, II, he determined to prepare an edition of the whole work, the first part of which will soon appear. In this paper he gives notes on books III and IV. There is not much in them which can be regarded as interesting apart from the context, and, as might be anticipated, a very large portion of them is devoted to the detection of the 'insulsa additamenta' of the copyists. Two or three extracts only can be made. iii 15: *ἐνθα τοῦ λοιποῦ διατῆτο ἔχων οὐδὲν βίαιον*. "Non haererem, si legeretur *ἔχων οὐδὲν κακόν* aut aliquid simile, sed *ἔχων οὐδὲν βίαιον* non magis Graecum videtur quam Latinum est *nihil habere*

violenti. Corrigendum suspicor (πά)ΣΧΩΝ." [But subsequently, in commenting on vi 9, οὐδὲν βαιότερον ἔξουσι οὐδὲν ἢ πρότερον εἶχον, he says that in this passage "iniuria pro ἔχων tentavi πάσχων."] iii 41, πεντηκόντερον πληρώσας [ἀνδρῶν] ἐσέβη ἐς αὐτήν. "Abiciatur manifestum emblema. Non sane asinos aut boves navi imposuit Polycrates." iii 52, οἰκτεῖρε. "Etiam sine titulorum ope sciri potuerat verum verbi formam esse οἰκτῖρειν. Nam sic tantum inde formari potuerunt nomina οἰκτιρμός et οἰκτίρμων, et huic soli formae respondet forma Aeolica οἰκτίρρειν, siquidem formae οἰκτεῖρειν respondere debebat οἰκτέρρειν." iii 69, εὐ εἶδέναι ὡς αἰστώσει μιν. "Pronomen noli cum Steinio interpretari ἑωυτήν, sed αὐτήν, nam Attice quoque hoc in simili compositione potius usurparetur quam illud. Contra *semet ipsum interfecit* Ionice non magis sonaret ἀπέκτεινέ μιν quam Attice ἀπέκτεινεν αὐτήν, sed in utraque dialecto necessarium foret pronomen reflexinum." iii 104: θερμότατος δέ ἐστι ὁ ἥλιος τούτοις τοῖσι ἀνθρώποις τὸ ἑωιδνόν [H. omits the last two words in his quotation], οὐ κατὰ περ τοῖσι ἄλλοις μεσαμβρίης, ἀλλ' ὑπερτεῖλας μέχρι οὐ ἀγορῆς διαλύσιος. τούτων δὲ τὸν χρόνον καίει πολλῶ μάλλον ἢ τῇ μεσαμβρίῃ [τὴν Ἑλλάδα], οὕτω ὥστε ἐν (abesse malim ἐν) ὕδατι λόγος αὐτοῦς ἐστι βρέχεσθαι τρικαῦτα. "Nihil horum intellexit quisquis interpolavit τὴν Ἑλλάδα. Nam procul dubio dixit scriptor, apud Indos tempus antemeridianum caldus esse quam post meridianum." This seems a very questionable criticism.

Cobet writes, pp. 433-442, *de locis nonnullis apud Aelianum ΠΕΡΙ ΖΩΩΝ*. i. 30: ὁ λάβραξ . . . εἴη ἂν, εἰ καὶ Ἡταίας ἐρῶ, ἰχθύων ὀψοφαγίστατος. "Bona fide Interpres: 'cum labendi periculo dicam.' Verum vidit Jacobs restituens Παίσας, sed indigne spretum est. In hoc quidem verbo semper Aelianus ἀπτικίζει scribens παῖσω, ἐπαισα, πέπαισται, συμπαίστης, non παῖσω, ἐπαῖσα cet. ut aequales solebant." ii 15: δίκην εὐρίνου ὕ κυνός. "Graecum est κύνων εὐρίς, κυνός εὐρινος, sed Graeculos ratio fugit qui εὐρινος nominativum esse inepte opinabantur . . . Fefellit homunciones versiculus Sophoclis in Aiace 7: κυνός Λακαίνης ὡς τις εὐρινος βάσις." iii 2: καμάτου δὲ ἡ τι αἰσθόνται ἡ οὐδέν. "Barbarum est αἰσθόνται pro αἰσθάνονται. Sero nati Graeculi opinabantur duo esse verba diversae significationis αἰσθεσθαι ἐπὶ τοῦ ἀκριβῶς εἶδέναι τι et αἰσθάνεσθαι ἐπὶ τοῦ ὑπονοεῖν. Cf. Bekk. *Anecdota*, p. 359, 6. Nihil esse in his veri quis hodie nescit?" xi 32: νύκτωρ ἦν πυράφορος καὶ ἐκ τοῦ λέχους ἀνεθόρνυστο. "Id est ἐκ τῆς κλίνης ἀνήλλετο et qui sic loquitur putat se ἀπτικιστί loqui. Quid est θόρνυσθαι, ἀναθόρνυσθαι, ἐπιθόρνυσθαι Aelianus non intellexit, qui putabat idem esse quod θρώσκειν, ἀναθρώσκειν, ἐπιθρώσκειν. Θόρνυσθαι est σπερμαίνειν, unde θόρος et θορή est σπέρμα, et cum notione *saliendi*, *exsiliendi* nihil commune habet." "Dixit alicubi Aelianus (xiii 15): οὐκ εἰμὶ ποιητῆς ὀνομάτων, quod gaudemus, nam si quando novum vocabulum fingit ridicule se dare solet. *Vinosus* ab omnibus Graecis dicitur φίλινος, ab Aeliano solo *οἰνεραστής*."

In pp. 443-448 Cobet concludes this part with some remarks *ad Galenum*. There are only about three suggestions of change in the text; but interesting extracts are made touching Galen's own study and his relation to the fashionable physicians of the day. One of these may be here quoted: "Pessime Galenus oderat Thessalum Neroni aequalem medicum (Tom. x, p. 7) et Thessali discipulos, ὄνους Θεσσαλείους et τὴν τῶν Θεσσαλείων ὄνων ἀγέλην. Itaque Galenus καίτοι οὐκ εἰθισμένος ἐξελέγχειν πικρῶς τοὺς σκαίους, ut ipsi ait Tom. x, p. 8,

asperrimis verbis passim insectatur hominem artis imperitum, impudentissimum, foedum Romanorum adulatorem. Tom. x, p. 5: ὁ Θεσσαλὸς οὐ τὰ ἄλλα μόνον ἐκολάκευε τοὺς ἐπὶ τῆς Ῥώμης πλουσίους, ἀλλὰ καὶ τῷ μισῶν ἐξ ἐπαγγελίας διδάξειν τὴν τέχνην, ἐτοίμως ἐλάμβανε μαθητὰς παμπόλλους. Praeclarus hic artis magister ex alta cathedra iactabat, nullum esse medicis usum οὐτε γεωμετρίας οὐτε ἀστρονομίας οὐτε διαλεκτικῆς οὐτε μονασικῆς οὐτε ἄλλον τινὸς μαθήματος τῶν καλῶν . . . διὰ τοῦτο καὶ σκυτοτόμοι καὶ τέκτονες καὶ βαφεῖς καὶ χαλκεῖς ἐπιτηδῶσιν ἤδη τοῖς ἔργοις τῆς ἱατρικῆς τὰς ἀρχαίας αὐτῶν ἀπολιπόντες τέχνας."

XIII, Part I.

The first fourteen pages of this part are filled by Cobet with notes *ad Galenum*. He finds some corrections to make, which are always happy, and cites many "memorabiles locos," which, notwithstanding their length, he says "non gravabor describere iis, quibus Galeni inspiciendi non est copia." "Notanda sunt quae Galenus, Tom. xi, p. 690, scribit de mari mortuo: τὸ τῆς ἐν Παλαιστίνῃ Συρία λίμνης ὕδωρ, ἣν ὀνομάζουσιν οἱ μὲν θάλασσαν νεκράν, οἱ δὲ λίμνην ἀσφαλίτιν, ἐστὶ μὲν γενομένης οὐχ ἁλκῶν μόνον ἀλλὰ καὶ πικρὸν, et p. 691: οὐδ' εἰ βούλοιο κατὰ τοῦ βάθους ἑαυτὸν φέρεσθαι κάτω δυνηθεῖς ἂν. οὕτως ἐξαίρει τε καὶ κομφίζει τὸ ὕδωρ· et p. 693: φαίνεται ἐν ἐκείνῳ τῷ ὕδατι μήτε ζῶον ἐγγιγνόμενον μήτε φυτόν, ἀλλὰ καὶ τῶν εἰς αὐτὴν ἐμβαλλόντων ποταμῶν ἀμφοτέρων μεγίστους καὶ πλείστους ἔχοντων ἰχθύας καὶ μάλιστα τοῦ πλησίον Ἰεριχοῦντος, ὃν Ἰορδάνην ὀνομάζουσιν, οὐδεὶς τῶν ἰχθύων ὑπερβαίνει τὰ στόματα τῶν ποταμῶν· κἂν εἰ συλλαβὸν τις αὐτοὺς ἐμβάλοι τῇ λίμνῃ διαφθειρομένους ὀψεται ταχέως. Tom. xii, p. 254: αἱ σάρκες τῶν ὥν εὐοικασίαι τῶν ἀνθρώπων. ἴσμεν γοῦν ἤδη πολλοὺς ἀλόντας πανδοκίας τε καὶ μαγειρίων ἐν τῷ πιπράσκειν ὥς ὕεια τὰ τῶν ἀνθρώπων κρέα, καίτις τῶν ἐσθιόντων αὐτὰ διαφορᾶς οὐδεμιᾶς οὐδεὶς ἠσθάνετο. ἀλλὰ καὶ διηγουμένων τινῶν ἤκουσα πιστῶν ἀνθρώπων ἔδηδοκεῖν μὲν ἐν τινι πανδοκείῳ ζωμὸν δαφυλῇ μετὰ κρεῶν ἡδίστων, ἥδη δὲ ἐμπεπλησμένον εὐρεῖν ἐν αὐτῷ δακτύλου μέρος τὸ πρὸςω κατ' αὐτὸν τὸν ὄνυχα, φοβηθέντες δὲ τοὺς ἐν τῷ πανδοκείῳ μὴ καὶ αὐτοὺς φάγωσιν ὥς ἐθισμένοι τὸν πρᾶγματος αὐτίκα μὲν ἐξέλθιν, ἐμέσαντες δὲ τὰ ἐδηδεσμένα τῆς ὁδοπορίας ἔχουσαι, καὶ μέντοι καὶ φωραθῆναι τοῖς κατὰ τὸ πανδοκεῖον οὐ μετὰ πολλὴν χρόνον ἔφασαν ἐφ' οἷς ἐσφαττον ἀνθρώποις. Tom. xiii, p. 267: ἡ τοῦ Φίλωνος (ἀντίδοτος) ἐνδοξος ἐγένετο· περὶ ἧς αὐτὸς ἐποίησε τάδε τὰ ἐλέγεια· Ταρσεὺς ἱητροῖο μέγα θνητοῖσι Φίλωνος· εὐρέμα πρὸς πολλὰς εἰμι παθῶν ὁδύνας. Sero nati hi poeta ita utuntur vetere lingua epica, ut vitia et errores aequalium admisceant. Ex nota analogia veteres dicebant εὐρέμα, εὐρεσις, ut βῆμα, βάσις; στήμα (σύστημα, διάστημα) στάσις; θῆμα (ἀνάθημα) θέσις· φύμα, φύσις· κρίμα, κρίσις· κλίμα, κλίσις· πῶμα, πόσις· et alia plura. In his omnibus Graeculorum συνήθεια longam vocalem in brevem convertit . . . et poetastri promiscue utuntur formis antiquis et novis . . . Philo melior medicus quam poeta utitur de industria oratione obscura et caliginosa σκοτεινῇ καὶ αἰνιγματώδεϊ . . . omitto plura eiusdem modi, sed mirificum est quod de opio canit: scribe ΠΙΟΝ et praefige articulum masculini generis Ὁ, et sic fiet ὄπιον et ὀπιον. Ὑπεῖ, inquit, τὸ ὄνομα ἐκ τῆς Ὁ φωνῆς καὶ τῆς ΠΙΟΝ σύγκειται διὰ τοῦτο ἐφη· ΠΙΟΝ δὲ γράψας ἄρθρον βάλε πρῶτον ἐπ' αὐτῷ | ἄρρεν. Haud vidi magis."

Next, pp. 15-42, Herwerden continues his *Herodotea*. v 49, 4: ἔχοντες κυρβάσις ἐπὶ τῇσι κεφαλῇσι. "Herodotus et Attici de coronis, pileis, galeis, et quovis capitis tegmine usurpant praepositionem περί, quam hi cum accusativo, ille

cum dativo iungere assolet. Praepositionem apud utrosque propter sequiorum usum ἐπί adhibentium saepissime oblitteratam fideliter libri et alibi frequentissime servarunt et vii 61 init. περὶ μὲν τῇσι κεφαλῇσι εἶχον τήρας." v. 79: ἀλὴν ποιησάμενοι. "Cf. i 125, ἀλὴν ἐποίησατο. Attici contra in ea re usurpant verbum activum, ποιεῖν ἐκκλησίαν, σύλλογον cett." v. 106, ἀλλ' εἴπερ τι τοιοῦτο οἶον οὐ εἰρηκας πρήσσει ὁ ἐμὸς ἐπίτροπος, ἴσθι αὐτὸν ἐπ' ἑωυτοῦ βαλλόμενον πεποιηκέναι. "Requiro ἐπρήξε vel ἐπέρηχε aut mox ποιέειν et βαλλόμενον, ut est iii 155, ἐπ' ἐμειωντοῦ βαλλόμενος ἐπρήξα, et iii 71. Eadem correctione indiget locus iv 160. Ita iam scripseram, cum subito me advertit soloecismus: ἴσθι αὐτὸν . . . πεποιηκέναι pro legitimo participio. Inspectis autem codicum scripturis video partem eorum pro Πεποιηκέναι exhibere πεπρηχέναι, quales discrepantiae reperiri solent in magistellorum supplementis. Scilicet neutra lectio genuina est, eaque deleta tam πρήσσει quam βαλλόμενον bene habet. Dederat Herodotus: ἀλλ' εἴπερ τι τοιοῦτο . . . πρήσσει . . . ἴσθι αὐτὸν ἐπ' ἑωυτοῦ βαλλόμενον, scito *eum proprio uti consilio*." On vi 31 he protests against Cobet's readiness to change present participles into aorists when the action is antecedent to that of the verb: for "saepissime tam apud Atticos quam apud Herodotum participium praesens reperitur, ubi sermo est de re saepius repetita et praesertim ubi mores et consuetudines describuntur, quibus locis paene omnibus Cobetus restitui iubet aoristos. Si tantum modo ageretur de levibus quibusdam discrepantiis, in quibus nulla omnino est codicum auctoritas, velut in scribendo γενόμενοι pro γινόμενοι . . . aliisque eiusmodi, viro summo obloqui non audem; sed non ita rem comparatam esse docebunt exempla nonnulla, a quorum correctione prudens manum abstinuit, ex ipso Herodoto mihi collecta, quaeque facili negotio augeri possunt"; and he then quotes i 203; ii 41 *bis*; 136; iii 38 *bis*; 128; 143; iv 23, and would on the same ground prefer to retain ἀπογινόμενον in v 4. On vi 33 he writes: "quod attinet ad Ἡροκόννησος, constat omnia nomina propria composita cum νῆσος semper liquidam duplicasse, excepta eo quod est Χερσόννησος, quod eadem constantia una liquida exarari solet." In vi 110 we are told that each of the στρατηγοί before Marathon offered his command to Miltiades; ὁ δὲ δεκόμενος οὐτι κω συμβολὴν ἐποιέετο, πρὶν γε δὴ αὐτοῦ πρὸς ταννίην ἐγένετο. "Vertunt, haud dubie recte, 'at ille, *quamvis acciperet*, non tamen prius commisit proelium quam legitimus ipsius dies adesset.' Subit mirari quid Miltiadem impulerit, ut oblatam sibi identidem ab aliis praetoribus summam imperii acciperet, si tamen ea non uti statuisset; itaque non dubito quin dictus sit ab Herodoto illam non accepisse, et hic quoque ut saepe perierit negatio. Corrigatur igitur: ὁ δὲ (οὐ) δεκόμενος κτέ. Bene attendendum ad imperfecti usum παρῑδίδοσαν, tradere volebant, offerebant." In his note on v 57, where he adopts Madvig's conjecture of οὐ πολλῶν for πολλῶν, he says: "incredibile dictu est quoties librarii negationem neglexerint," and gives references.

The next article, pp. 43-54, contains more notes by C. M. Francken, *ad Ciceronis Palimpsestos*. Francken has not the command of easy Latin which the writers in this journal generally possess, and his communications are somewhat hard reading. Most of the notes are too long for citation here; but one specimen may be given. "Archytas iratus propterea, quod iratus esset, servum delinquentem non occidit, ita illum compellans: 'o te infelicem, quem necassem iam verberibus, nisi iratus essem.' Legendum 'o te felicem,' felix erat eo quod Archytas iratus esset et nihil ab irato faciendum esse putaret.

'Ergo Archytas iracundiam videlicet dissidentem a ratione seditionem quandam **ABANIMORE** DUCEBAT.' Sic manus prior; altera deleta *ab* suprascriptis MI supra NIM, VE supra OR, quod interpretatur Halmius recte: *animi movere ducebat*, a quo non erat descendendum; Baiterus cum Weissenbornio: 'ab animo removendam censebat,' Reisig 'animi vere ducebat' quod ipse olim probavi, sed dies diem docet: *vere* enim a sententia alienum, quamvis probatum ab Hauptio et C. Muellero; si iudicio Laelii indigeret dictum Archytæ, posset plane omitti, non Laelius Archytæ sed contra Archytas Laelio auctoritatem conciliat. Legatur igitur: 'iracundiam, videlicet dissidentem a ratione: seditionem quandam *animo* movere ducebat.'"

We have more 'Observationes Criticæ in Herodotum,' pp. 55-81, from Naber. He traverses the whole nine books, and it is hard to make a typical selection for this notice. Naber's confidence in his own improvements leaves nothing to be desired. 'Ecquis contradicet?' he says, in so many words or in effect, nearly always. On i 98 Stein maintains that while we must write *ῥσσω*, the Ionic verb is *ἑσσοῦσθαι*. "Fieri potest ut contra omnium codicum consensum nihil mutandum sit, quamquam mirum sit *ῥσσω* iis potuisse placere, qui tamen pronunciarent *ἑσσοῦσθαι*, sed tamen confiteor multa esse ejusmodi quorum rationem haud ita facile perspicere possis . . . scribimus tamen *κρέσσων* et *μέζων* quia sic voluere librarii. Quid autem *θάσσω*, *ἄσσω*, et *μᾶλλον*? Nonne Ionice scribendum est *θάσσω*, *ἄσσω* et *μᾶλλον*, si quidem Ionica sunt *κρέσσων* et *μέζων*? En ea certe re nihil attinet codices interrogare." "Apud Babylonios aegroti inferrentur in forum I 197; deinde medicum agit quicumque *αὐτὸς τοιοῦτον* *ἐπαθε* *ὁκοῖον* *ἔχει* *ὁ κάμνων* *ἢ ἄλλον* *εἶδε* *παθόντα*. *ταῦτα* *προσιόντες* *συμβουλευόντι* *καὶ* *παραιένουσι*, *ἄσσω* *αὐτὸς* *ποιήσας* *ἐξέφυγε* *ὁμοίην* *νοῦσον* *ἢ ἄλλον* *εἶδε* *ἐκφυγόντα*. Ipsa rei ratio suadet, ut bis *οἶδε* rescribamus. Argumento sunt quoque aoristi *παθόντα* et *ἐκφυγόντα*, nec quidquam cuiquam prodest ut medicus fiat vidisse *τούς τι παθόντας*." In iv 75 we are told of the use the Scythians make of the vapor arising from the burning seeds of the cannabis. *τοῦτό σφι ἀντὶ λουτροῦ ἐστι*. *οὐ γὰρ δὴ λούονται ὕδατι τὸ παράπαν τὸ σῶμα* . . . "Haec, inquam, intelligi possunt; sed quid est illud quod interponitur: *οἱ δὲ Σκῑθαι ἀγάμενοι τῇ πυρρίῃ ὠρύονται*. Inaudita est constructio verbi *ἀγασθαι* eaque etiam Valckenaerio offensioni fuit. Deinde quid est *ὠρύονται*? Talem vim in cannabi inesse narrant . . . Perscribit Valckenaerius multas aliorum conjecturas, *ἀρύονται*, *πυριῶνται*, *ὀριγνῶνται*, ipsi *ῥύπονται* placet. Nihil horum Steinio dignum fuit visum quod commemoraretur et putare videtur *ὠρύονται* sic satis bene explicari posse. Haud male ad loci sententiam Valckenaerius *ῥύπονται* scripsit, etiamsi ab participio *ἀγάμενοι*, sapienter fortasse, manus abstinerit. Fieri potest ut tam illustre exemplum sequi deberem, idque sequerem, nisi satis lenis mutatio sese mihi obtulisset. Quid si Herodotus scripsit: *οἱ δὲ Σκῑθαι διανόμενοι τῇ πυρρίῃ χρίονται καὶ τοῦτό σφι ἀντὶ λουτροῦ ἐστι*." In v 92 the ghost of Melissa, wife of Periander, complains that she is freezing: *τῶν γὰρ οἱ συγκατέβαψε εἰμάτων ὄφελος εἶναι οὐδὲν οὐ κατακαυθέντων*. "Inaudita querela est, quam tum demum intelligere possemus, si Melissa omni veste detracta in rogam imposita fuisset. Sed ricinia cum cadavere comburuntur; jam nullus eorum usus est; itaque Melissa questa est *εἰμάτων ὄφελος εἶναι οὐδὲν συγκατακαυθέντων*." But Herodotus goes on to say that Periander, on a festival, stripped the Corinthian matrons of their best array, *κόσμῳ τῷ καλλίστῳ* et *συμφορήσας ἐς ὄργημα*

Μελίσση ἐπευχόμενος κατέκαιε. "Itaque his vestibis misera Melissa non magis uti potuit: nuda mansit ut erat, nec video quomodo ejus iraplacata sit. Deinde vestes in fossam, ὄρυγμα, collatae ne cremari quidem possunt, dum fumus omnia obtinet et aer intercluditur." The solution is that by κόσμος is meant the gold ornaments of the ladies, and that these "non κατέκαιε sed συμφορήσας ἐς ὄρυγμα κατεκλήμε. Hoc magis decebat hominem avarum, qui tunc hoc agebat ut παρακαταθήκην ξεινικὴν interciperet." This appears a truly amazing exegesis. After this article of Naber's, Herwerden says: "Satisfacere debeo Nabero meo de iniuriis, quas certa quadam de causa nimium festinans primi Herodoti mei voluminis editionem ei intuli." The wrong consists in his having not availed himself as he ought of Naber's notes, published in *Mnemosyne* for 1853-4. The cause of this 'paene incredibilis socordia' is that at that time he had entered some of those emendations in the margin of his copy, and fancied that he had entered them all. Hence it has come to pass that he has attributed to himself or to Cobet corrections originally proposed by Naber. He gives a list of these; and mentions others through books I and II which he wishes he had known. He promises more care for the future.

The last pages of this part are occupied with critical notes, first on Lucian, and then on the Roman History of Dionysius of Halicarnassus, by K. G. P. Schwartz. Many of the suggestions made have much probability; but none of them states any principle of general interest, or which seems important enough to deserve quotation.

On the parts of pages otherwise unoccupied, H. W. van der Mey contributes a few notes on Diodorus Siculus.

C. D. MORRIS.